

**MINUTES
CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY MEETING
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2009**

**600 BERCUT DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811
(916) 445-5073**

Meeting held at: Los Angeles Sheriff's Headquarters Building, 4700 Ramona Blvd, Monterey Park, CA
91754, 1st Floor Media Room

Mr. Matthew Cate, Chair, welcomed everyone to the November 19, 2009 Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) meeting. Mr. Cate asked everyone to stand for the pledge.

Mr. Wilson, Executive Director, Corrections Standards Authority announced that Mr. Adams and Ms. Minor were on their way from the airport.

The following members were in attendance:

Mr. Cate	Ms. Minor	Mr. Ingrassia	Ms. Epps
Mr. Kernan	Ms. Silva	Ms. Silbert	Mr. Townsy
Mr. Warner	Mr. Baca	Ms. Campbell	Mr. Adams
Ms. Bates	Ms. Penner	Ms. Biondi	

ABSENCE OF BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Wilson announced the absences of the Board members and the reason for their absence.

Mr. Prieto, Ms. Arnold and Ms. McBrayer had prior commitments. There was a quorum.

Sheriff Baca welcomed Staff and Members.

Mr. Cate announced that Mr. Townsy was honored by the Association of Black Correctional Workers.

Mr. Wilson, Executive Director, CSA, provided the Board with an update.

A: CONSENT CALENDAR:

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2009 BOARD MEETING,
AB 900 2007 LOCAL JAIL CONSTRUCTION FUNDING PROGRAM
REGULATIONS REVISION, AB 900 JAIL SITE ASSURANCE REQUIREMENT
AMADOR COUNTY, & SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY PROBATION UPDATE
(AGENDA ITEMS A-1, A-2, A-3 & A-4)

Mr. Cate asked for a motion to accept the consent calendar agenda items A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4.

Ms. Bates asked for an extension of the September Minutes.

A motion to accept the items on the consent calendar with an exception of Item A-1, the September minutes was made by Mr. Kernan and seconded by Ms. Silbert. The motion carried.

B: DISCUSSION ITEMS:

EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AB 900 JAIL CONSTRUCTION AWARDS 2009 EDITION (AGENDA ITEM B-1)

Leslie Heller presented this item. The Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) Board is presented with the Assembly Bill (AB) 900 Jail Construction Executive Steering Committee's (ESC) recommendation for conditional award related to the 2009 Edition (Round 2) Request for Proposals (RFP) process. Following the CSA Board's direction in January 2009, the AB 900 Jail Construction ESC reconvened to develop the components of a second AB 900 Phase I RFP for construction or expansion of county jails. The CSA Board subsequently approved the timeline of key events for the RFP process, the \$194,426,779 available for award under this RFP, and approved the release of the 2009 Edition of the RFP in July 2009. One proposal was received by the October 8, 2009 deadline for proposal submission. Solano County has requested jail construction financing in the amount of \$61,545,000 to construct a new 362-bed county jail facility. The ESC has subsequently reviewed and rated the proposal following the historical protocol established by CSA for competitive construction award programs and the protocol followed in the first AB 900 RFP process. The ESC finds Solano County's proposal worthy of funding and is recommending that the Board conditionally award the full amount requested. Should the Board conditionally award Solano County, there still remains a balance of \$132,881,779 in Phase I funding that is not conditionally awarded at this time. The CSA Board previously determined that any county conditionally awarded AB 900 jail construction financing must assist the state in siting a state reentry facility. Should Solano County be awarded by the CSA Board, the county would be required to enter into a state reentry facility Siting Agreement with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation within 90 days of receiving formal notice of their jail construction conditional award, following the established protocol in the AB 900 process. Staff recommends that the Board adopt the ESC's recommendation and conditionally award Solano County in the full amount of \$61,545,000.

Ms. Heller asked for questions and noted that Sheriff Stanton was available to answer questions.

Mr. Cate asked if the Board had any questions or if any members of the public would like to comment on the item.

A motion to accept the staff recommendation was made by Mr. Ingrassia and seconded by Ms. Silbert.

Mr. Cate asked for public comment.

San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office Captain John Huber spoke on behalf of Sheriff Steve Moore, thanking the CSA Board for their conditional award and requesting an adjustment for inflation in consideration of the length of time that has passed, suggesting that the left over \$132 million could be used for that purpose. Captain Huber stated they would also like the Board to consider utilizing the remainder of the Phase I funds for structures, such as a kitchen and administration building, that was to be San Joaquin County's Phase II project. Captain Huber added that they would like CSA to consider lifting the requirement of a 15 foot buffer between existing buildings and the lease-revenue bond funded building which would allow San Joaquin County to use some of the infrastructure located in their existing central plant. Captain Huber further stated that Sheriff Moore would like to offer his support to Calaveras County, one of their partners in their regional reentry project, and asked that CDCR populate and begin operation of the sited reentry facility located on Arch Road and allow it to be opened as soon as possible. They are looking forward to working with CDCR on the reentry project and the other two facilities as well.

Undersheriff Richard Beemer, appearing on behalf of San Bernardino County Sheriff Rod Hoops, voiced their support for Solano County Sheriff Gary Stanton's request for \$61 million for their AB 900 jail construction project and added that Sheriff Stanton has provided leadership and plays an important role in CSSA's work in corrections. Undersheriff Beemer said much has changed since this process began. Initially the ESC set funding caps in an effort to spread the dollars between large, medium and small counties. Since that time however, costs have changed and the Undersheriff suggested using the remaining \$133 million to allow counties to ask for the difference between the awarded amount and their 75 % need. In San Bernardino's case, they would request an additional \$8 million dollars, with the understanding that the county would still be committed to the 25% match.

Calaveras County Sheriff Dennis Downum requested some kind of written documentation saying that the state bond funds are secure and will eventually become available as this was causing a lot of concern in his county. Sheriff Downum supports the idea to allow counties to ask for more funds for costs that have been added to their projects since this process began.

At this point, Mr. Cate welcomed Mr. Adams and introduced Ms. Minor as a new member to the CSA Board.

Mr. Cate stated that there has been no opposition to the staff recommendation to conditionally award Solano County and suggested taking a vote on that issue and then addressing the other issues that were brought before the Board.

In reference to the motion on the floor made prior to public comment by Mr. Ingrassia and seconded by Ms. Silbert, Mr. Cate called for vote to accept the staff's and the ESC's recommendation to conditionally award Solano County in the full amount of \$61,545,000 million. The motion carried.

Mr. Cate asked if staff were prepared to address the issues raised today or if more time were needed.

Mr. Wilson stated, based on what he heard, there are essentially two issues; one of them being the desire to divert additional funding from Phase I to currently funded counties, and secondly is the issue of written documentation from CSA that states the funding is secure. Both of those issues go beyond CSA's sole control therefore it is not something that can be completely addressed today. Mr. Wilson offered to come back with recommendations at a future meeting.

Mr. Cate asked if there was any more information that could be provided to the Board about the process that might be helpful to the counties.

Ms. Heller replied that the counties would need to speak to that directly but that CSA does frequently get asked the question that Sheriff Downum posed of whether the state could guarantee that the funding is secure. Unfortunately CSA can not offer a guarantee as to the funding because it is reliant upon the bond market and these projects are not yet at a point in which bonds are to be sold.

Mr. Wilson added that the State Public Works Board and the Department of Finance would need to be a part of this discussion as well.

Mr. Cate asked if there was any harm in working with the Sheriff to see if there was any information that could be provided short of a guarantee. Ms. Heller responded that staff would be willing to work with the Sheriff and provide any information available.

Sheriff Baca remarked that another alternative would be that every county that has been granted an award would have the opportunity to acquire the additional money. So rather than taking on exceptions, the Board would make it an overall policy that the same money (remaining Phase I funding) can be proportionately distributed equally to all counties.

Mr. Wilson suggested that staff could come back to the January CSA Board meeting with recommendations and a further evaluation of the options proposed.

Sheriff Baca added comments about how the rules can change to allow for the redistribution of the money.

Ms. Heller explained that there are counties that are overmatched; that is they are contributing more than the required 25% match to their AB 900 projects. This overmatch amounts to approximately \$133 million and, there is \$132 million in Phase I funding that is currently unallocated. All of the small counties are not overmatched in that same way, however the legislation allowed for a reduction in match. Initially, there were four small counties that petitioned the Board and received a reduction in match. Ms. Heller suggested that there are additional possibilities in terms of match reduction. Ms. Heller added that staff has heard from other counties echoing Sheriff Baca's suggestion about some equitable distribution of the funds to all of the counties.

Ms. Silbert stated that she does understand what the counties are going through but feels very strongly that this was a reentry bill. She questioned if there is a way to equitably

distribute the money if it was just going into the building process, or if it could be used as part the reentry process to complete the reentry circle between the county and the state.

Sheriff Baca added his comments and insight regarding reentry stating that there are other models for reentry programs. The Sheriff explained, in part, a reentry proposal that he intends to present to Secretary Cate and will share with the Board and others. He supports reentry but wants reentry the way he wants it, not the way the state wants it.

Mr. Cate suggested that there is more than one option to consider and the Board should have those options identified before a decision is made. For example, have the remaining funds moved in to Phase II but make the money available to counties on a more lenient basis while still requiring the counties to provide land for a reentry site, or some combination of options. Mr. Cate added that his preference would be for staff to come back and let the Board know what their options are so the Board can make an informed decision.

Ms. Bates asked for clarification as to the use of the bond funds and if the bond money can be used for reentry programs or only for capital construction projects. Mr. Cate confirmed that the bond money is for construction only for both the jail projects and reentry facilities.

Ms. Penner asked what the known procedural and statutory issues are concerning the use of the bond money.

Mr. Wilson replied that while some of those issues fall within the CSA scope, some fall outside of the scope. For example, these are lease-revenue bonds and not general obligation bonds, meaning that there is a different set of criteria in how the funds can be spent. Mr. Wilson added that he had originally suggested bringing this item back to the Board for discussion at the January meeting, but due to the amount of questions, staff will need until the March CSA Board meeting to provide a more in-depth answer and to provide a full legal analysis.

Ms. Penner stated that the Board may not be able to move forward if it was a matter of enacting legislation in order to change the rules.

Sheriff Baca added that counties and Sheriffs are fearful that even what has been approved thus far will not happen and that he would be very opposed to taking the money out of the (Phase I) fund until the Board has addressed giving it proportionately to the counties and seek legislation in order to do that if necessary.

Mr. Townsy recognized Sheriff Baca's comments and added that the RFP was very definitive relative to the rules.

Ms. Heller, addressing Ms. Penner's questions, stated that the AB 900 legislation allows for acquisition, design and construction. CSA has always just considered the construction piece being funded with state dollars and that was historically all that has been allowed for in previous legislations. When the ESC met and discussed how the legislation read versus what has been tradition, the ESC chose to stay with tradition and allow state dollars to only fund construction in order to spread the state dollars as far as possible. The legislation also states that the medium and large counties over 200,000 in population have

to provide a 25% match and did not define what that means in terms of cash and/or in-kind match. The legislation further states that counties with populations of 200,000 or less can petition the CSA Board for a reduction in match but also does not define whether it applies to cash or in-kind match for the small counties. Then the ESC, in keeping with tradition, defined the percentages that went in to the RFP and subsequently approved by this Board. It is the Board's decision if they wish to change that now in order to allow the remaining state funds to be distributed. And, in order for some of the counties to benefit from this further distribution of the funds, the rules would need to be changed because some counties are currently at 75% in construction dollars. In order for the counties to gain more of the funding, the Board would need to allow the state funding to pay for other cash match items, such as architectural costs. It will require staff to work with the State Public Works Board to allow funds to be used for costs other than construction.

Ms. Silbert suggested that the Board could redefine the definition of soft costs for construction as was done in the past.

Mr. Cate asked if there was a sub-committee of the ESC to address these issues.

Ms. Penner added that there was talk of reconvening the ESC. Ms. Penner asked if the issue is something that is with the CSA Board now or is it elsewhere concerning the lease-revenue bonds which would cause it to run in to a road block. She added if there are no issues with the lease-revenue bonds, can a decision be made about the left over funding by this Board if they chose to break from the tradition of allowing only construction costs?

Ms. Heller replied that Ms. Penner was correct in that the AB 900 legislation says that the lease-revenue bonds for jail projects can be used to design, acquire, and construct jail facilities.

Ms. Biondi asked if giving these counties more money would be creating issues for counties who were not awarded funds at all.

Ms. Heller replied that the counties that were not awarded funds could not meet the reentry siting requirement.

Ms. Penner asked if it was advisable for the ESC to look at the issues to see if they fall under the purview of this Board.

Mr. Cate responded that he would like more guidance by the ESC on this issue.

Sheriff Baca asked if a motion could be made to ask Mr. Wilson and staff to research the CSA Board's discretionary authority on the issue and if the Board does have the authority then we can proceed with a plan that should be decided now.

Mr. Cate asked for clarification from Sheriff Baca in that was he suggesting that the Board have the debate today about how the money would be spent if the Board had the authority and then have staff do the research and bring a similar proposal back to the Board. Mr. Cate added that his request was to find out what the Board's options are and that the Sheriff's point is if we already know what we want, why not act on that instead.

Sheriff Baca stated that he believes that the Board does have the authority to make the decision and the Board should do so before adjourning today.

Mr. Townsy offered that in previous times this was considered on a case by case basis.

Sheriff Baca said he would rather deal with the whole issue rather than on a case by case basis adding that even if they dealt with the two requests today, they still would have money left over. The Sheriff suggested that the money be placed in escrow status until a time when it can be used and it is known what the true construction costs are after the bids come in.

Mr. Cate added that he has a concern making a decision without giving public notice. He noted Sheriff Baca's point to make a non-binding decision but also stated that he would like to hear from the other parties who may be interested before making a final decision. Another of his concerns is how quickly they can move to Phase II of the AB 900 funding in order to get more counties to site reentry facilities. He has concerns about every dollar that goes to a county that is already awarded funds is one less dollar that can go to a county that wants to site reentry in Phase II. He added we may need to change the rules in Phase II to make it more lenient so the dollars can be distributed in a fair way.

Ms. Silva added that she would like to have this come back at a future meeting because she would like to know what the options are before making a decision.

Mr. Kernan asked if the Office of Legal Affairs has looked at this issue.

Mr. Wilson replied that legal staff has not yet had a chance to review the issues and from his perspective, coming back at a future meeting would be best to allow legal staff the time to analyze and provide an opinion that addresses the issues.

Mr. Warner suggested that staff could work with the ESC to come up with policy options for the Board before the next meeting while legal staff works on the legal issues so that the Board could make a decision based on whatever the legal findings would be at that time.

Mr. Wilson replied that there would be difficulty convening the ESC before the scheduled January meeting due to the holidays.

Ms. Silbert asked if legal staff could look at whether it is possible to re-issue the RFP to allow for broader options.

Sheriff Baca stated that he does not want to see any other options than what the counties are asking for today; that is asking for extra money, but if there are other options, providing more state funds to existing counties should be one of them. He wants to know if the Board has the legal authority to provide more state funds to the counties.

There was discussion between Mr. Cate, Ms. Silbert and Sheriff Baca about achieving more reentry facilities in Phase II and working to get an acceptable reentry plan for Los Angeles County while still helping the Sheriffs in other counties build their jails.

Ms. Heller asked if it was the desire of the Board that staff comes back at the January

meeting with options.

There were questions whether or not legal staff would have enough time to do an analysis.

Mr. Warner suggested that the ESC reconvene to provide recommendations to the Board but that the legal opinions could take longer pushing this decision into summer.

Mr. Kernan reminded the Board that Mr. Wilson had said earlier it would be difficult to reconvene the ESC before the January meeting. Ms. Heller added that it would be likely that another form of the ESC would need to be appointed due to some of the original members retiring or resigning.

Ms. Heller noted that, as the Chair expressed, there are Sheriffs that were not given notice that this discussion was going to place. Sheriff Baca added that he did not think there is a Sheriff or county who would not take the extra money if it were there to take.

Ms. Epps stated that there are questions outstanding, primarily what can be done with the excess money, what are the legal parameters within the bill and can CSA make decisions regarding the remaining funds? Ms. Epps asked if it were possible to get an answer to those questions by March so the Board can move forward in an informed way.

Mr. Cate asked staff to provide clarification about who is on the ESC and what it would take to get a functional ESC that can meet in a reasonable amount of time to work with legal staff and CSA staff to provide options and make recommendations to the Board.

Mr. Wilson stated that staff would work with legal staff to be able to come back with answers to the questions by January and that he could not speak on behalf of the legal staff about their ability to do this by January but would certainly try.

Ms. Penner suggested that there should be a process in place that is fair and equitable. All 58 counties should be noticed to address the issue.

Mr. Townsy stated that he recalled a very similar meeting about a year ago when the RFP was changed and he asked if staff could recall what the reason for the change was.

Ms. Heller recalled the meeting in Galt and stated that what staff presented to the Board were three different options on what to do with the funding at that time since the eligible funding list had been exhausted. The first option was to issue the second RFP, the second was to roll the money into Phase II and the third option was to supplement the currently funded projects. A number of counties addressed the Board at that meeting.

Mr. Cate asked how those options were reached. Ms. Heller replied that those were options that were brought to the Board by CSA staff.

Mr. Cate said there are a couple options before the Board; the Board could have the ESC work with staff to bring options back with a recommendation at the next meeting or not have the ESC work on it and have staff bring it back to the Board when they can.

Ms. Heller added that maybe an option would be to come back with more information in

January to address as many of the issues as possible that had come about today and it would be on the agenda, thereby noticing the other counties.

Mr. Cate asked staff to bring the issue back at the next meeting for the Board to make a decision at that point. Ms. Heller asked if the issue of the ESC re-convening could be left open because she does not think we are in the position to commit them at this point.

Mr. Wilson stated that staff will be in contact with legal staff to initiate the process but cannot guarantee an answer from legal by January. Staff will make every attempt to have an answer by then.

Mr. Cate asked for further discussion. Hearing none, Mr. Cate moved on to the next agenda item.

STC PROGRAM STATUS REPORT

(AGENDA ITEM B-2)

Wayne Landberg presented this agenda item which will provide a statistical report on the activities of the Standards and Training for Corrections Program for fiscal year 2008-2009 in addition to a report on agency compliance for the same reporting period. Pursuant to Article 2, Section 6035 of the Penal Code and Title 15, Sections 100-355 of the California Code of Regulations, the Corrections Standards Authority is responsible for the implementation of selection and training standards for personnel employed in local corrections agencies. The Standards and Training for Corrections (STC) Division has carried out these responsibilities on the Board's behalf since 1980. This agenda item reports, for FY 2008-2009, the results of the activities undertaken by the STC Division to accomplish these assigned responsibilities. In accordance with section 6035 of the Penal Code and Section 318 of the California Code of Regulations, Corrections Standards Authority's Standards and Training for Corrections staff is required to monitor participating agencies' adherence to standards and compliance with policies and procedures of the STC Program on an annual basis. The purpose of this compliance monitoring process is to assure that each agency operates in accordance with its approved and funded Annual Training Plan (ATP), the program regulations, and the law. The monitoring process consists of taking a random sample as follows: In agencies with 30 or fewer STC eligible positions, all staff are included in the sample; In agencies with 31 to 999 STC eligible positions, at least 10%, but in no case less than 30 positions will be included in the sample; In agencies with 1000 or more STC eligible positions, at least 5% of STC eligible positions will be included in the sample. In addition, each department administrator is required to review their department's compliance status and report any compliance problems to STC staff. Any individual identified by a department as a compliance issue is added to the sample. All individual training records are monitored for program eligibility, valid certification of courses attended, training hours required for compliance, training hours actually received, and special or out-of-state certifications granted. Rosters and/or certifications are verified for all training being claimed for credit. This information is used to determine individual and departmental compliance. During FY 2008-2009, 180 agencies submitted applications to participate in the STC Program. This total reflects the addition of Seal Beach Police Department and Signal Hill Police department to the STC Program. In addition, 13 agencies were Community Corrections Facilities (CCF) under contract to the CDCR and were monitored for compliance with State standards by STC staff. This agenda item addresses the 167 local agencies that were funded by the Board for their participation in the STC Program during the FY 2008-2009.

During the months of July through September of 2009, STC staff conducted on-site monitoring of the training records of these 167 agencies. Attachment B summarizes the findings of these activities. Of the local agencies funded, 84 were found to be in Full Compliance, 68 were in Substantial Compliance, and 15 agencies were out of compliance in accordance to their ATP's and the STC regulations, policies and procedures. Each individual with a compliance issue within these agencies was evaluated on a case-by-case basis as required by the CSA policy. These agencies provided supplemental information regarding the reasons why staff were not in full compliance with standards and described the actions they took to correct the problem. As a result of this review, 70 agencies are recommended for Substantial Compliance consideration under the policy previously cited. Staff reviews were completed in accordance with the policy adopted by the CSA Board for Substantial Compliance, which states: The definition for program compliance is currently 100% adherence to all standards. This definition will be expanded to include the category of Substantial Compliance. In order to determine if a department qualifies for Substantial Compliance, STC staff review departments on a case-by-case basis, and determine if the following criteria has been met for a determination of Substantial Compliance: an employee's significant unanticipated leave at the end of the fiscal training year made it impractical to complete the required training; an employee was absent from work for 6 months or more within the fiscal training year; a personnel problem involving an employee but the participating agency has taken positive steps to correct the problem; an innocent error (e.g., record keeping error, clerical error, computer data-entry error, etc.); or the number of staff or the number of hours lacking for full compliance is insignificant compared to the agency's total training obligation, and this occurred despite the agency's exercising due diligence in the management and oversight of the training program. All 15 of the local agencies listed under the category of out of compliance on Attachment B are first year out of compliance departments. Attachment C contains a listing of all local and CCF departments out of compliance, the number of eligible staff; the minimum required training hours, and the number of staff that failed to meet the training standard. The fiscal years of 2003/2004-2005/2006 involved a period of no funding to the agencies and annual reviews were conducted for that period by reporting the percentage of total staff that met training standards. Following are the mandatory sanctions adopted by the Board for local agencies found to be out of compliance: First-Year: Notice to department head and respective county CAO; detailed ATP; corrective action plan; quarterly on-site technical review; regular quarterly allocation. Second-Year: Notice to department head and county CAO; detailed ATP; comprehensive corrective action plan; quarterly on-site STC monitoring; retroactive allocation of funds on a quarterly basis if the department is in compliance with their approved training plan. Third-Year: Deny department participation in the STC Program for one year. In accordance with STC policies and procedures the 15 local agencies that were found to be out of compliance for FY 2008-2009 are required to submit corrective action plans to remedy the problems in the succeeding fiscal year. Staff recommends that the Board approve those local departments listed on Attachment B in Substantial Compliance as having met the Board's criteria for successful participation in the Standards and Training for Corrections Program.

Mr. Cate asked for any questions from the Board or public, there were none.

A motion to accept staff recommendations was made by Ms. Penner and seconded by Mr. Ingrassia. The motion carried.

ENHANCED DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT (AGENDA ITEM B-3)

Shaline Hunter presented this agenda item. This agenda item requests Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) approval of award recommendations made by the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Subcommittee for two separate Requests for Proposals (RFPs): the Enhanced DMC Technical Assistance Project II (DMC-TAP II) and the DMC Support Grant Program. As part of the Title II Formula Grants Program, the DMC-TAP II program supports probation departments' efforts in understanding and identifying DMC and will equip these agencies with the tools and resources needed to provide leadership in developing community-based DMC reduction activities. The DMC Support Grant Program provides funding for counties to sustain or enhance the work currently aimed at reducing disparity and disproportionality within the local juvenile justice system. Provided funds are available, counties selected to participate in these projects will be granted funds to support their work for up to three years. At its July 16, 2009 meeting, the CSA authorized staff to proceed with RFPs for the DMC-TAP II and DMC Support Grant funding opportunities utilizing the DMC Subcommittee (a standing Executive Steering Committee of the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention) for oversight of each process. There is approximately \$1 million available for the DMC-TAP II projects and \$700,000 available for the DMC Support projects for the first year of implementation. Both RFPs were issued on July 20, 2009 and proposals were due to CSA October 5, 2009. The CSA received eight (8) proposals in response to the DMC-TAP II RFP and seven (7) proposals in response to the DMC Support Grant Program RFP. After a technical compliance review by CSA staff to determine if the proposals met the RFP requirements, seven (7) proposals for the DMC-TAP II and six (6) for the DMC Support Grant Program moved forward to the raters for evaluation and scoring. Six of the DMC Subcommittee members participated in the proposal evaluation process for both RFPs. They are: Sandra McBrayer- Chair, Chief Executive Officer, The Children's Initiative, Judge Gail Brewster Bereola, Juvenile Court/Superior Court, Alameda County, Pamela Gilyard, Supervising Probation Officer, Sacramento, Sandy Keaton, Sr. Criminal Justice Research Analyst, SANDAG; Iona Mara-Drita, Sr. Research Analyst, Administrative Office of the Courts, Tanisha Worthy, Sacramento County District Attorney's Office. Rater Training was conducted for the above named Subcommittee members regarding CSA's competitive grant process, rating criteria for each RFP, and the scoring system. Evaluation and scoring of the proposals was completed November 9, 2009. On November 17, 2009 the scoring results and rankings of proposals for each program were discussed by the Subcommittee members and then utilized to form the funding recommendations for the Board's consideration. Award recommendations for each grant program are provided in Attachment A. Staff will notify applicants of the Board's action and the resultant grant awards and then conduct a New Grantee Briefing session, schedule for December 9, 2009. Staff will develop and process the grant agreements (contracts), with an implementation start date of January 1, 2010. Staff recommends the CSA Board approve the funding recommendations developed by the DMC Subcommittee for the DMC-TAP II and DMC Support Grant Program.

Ms. Hunter asked for questions.

Mr. Cate asked for any additional comments from the Board or the Public, there were none.

A motion to accept staff recommendations was made by Ms. Biondi and seconded by Ms. Eleanor Silva. The motion carried.

PROUD PARENTING PROGRAM APPROVAL OF 10 GRANT AWARDS

(AGENDA ITEM B-4)

Oscar Villegas presented this agenda item which requests Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) approval of funding recommendations made by the Proud Parenting Program Executive Steering Committee (ESC). Approximately \$835,000 is available to support ten (ten) grant projects during Fiscal Year 2009-10. Successful applicants will receive funding for up to three years of implementation, providing funds are available in subsequent years, and that grantees continue to show progress toward stated goals. In March 2009, the CSA Board authorized the establishment of an ESC to oversee the development and administration of a new Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Proud Parenting Program. This would be the first release of an RFP since CSA assumed responsibility for administration of this grant program in 2005. The ESC, chaired by CSA Board Member Cleotha Adams, met twice in April 2009 to develop the RFP. While this new RFP preserved the intent and goals of the original program curriculum, it now contains additional program outcome requirements that will provide CSA with data necessary to conduct a cross-site evaluation and determine whether the projects are effective. At the May 2009 Board meeting, the CSA Board authorized staff to release the RFP and add two additional members to the ESC to assist with proposal scoring, Ms. Kimberly Epps (CSA Board member) and Ms. Tiffanye Edwards-Rodgers (AmeriCorps member). Three weeks after release of the RFP, CSA staff chose to temporarily suspend the RFP due to growing concerns about the state budget crisis and the impending cuts to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Temporary suspension of the RFP was viewed as the most prudent action given the circumstances. Upon execution of the State Budget, CSA learned that \$835,000 in local assistance was included for support of the Proud Parenting Program. CSA re-released the RFP in August 2009 following discussions with legislative staff confirming the program's continuation. On September 25, 2009, CSA received 20 proposals. Staff conducted a technical review of each proposal and determined that two (2) of the proposals did not meet the technical requirements and were therefore disqualified. The remaining 18 proposals were forwarded to the ESC for evaluation and scoring. On October 7, staff conducted rater training for the ESC members regarding CSA's competitive grant process, rating criteria and scoring system. On October 26, 2009, the ESC met to discuss the proposals and finalize the rankings. Additional due diligence by CSA staff determined that one of the proposals which was recommended by the ESC for funding did not meet the required criteria for the RFP. Staff is therefore recommending removal of this program from funding consideration and is recommending funding for the next program in the ranked order. The list of the programs recommended for funding is attached. It should be noted that the delay in release of the RFP will result in an initial grant period of approximately seven (7) months. However, this issue was anticipated during RFP development and "Readiness to Proceed" was used as one of the proposal rating factors. All prospective grantees are aware that CSA is working under an unusually short time-frame. Should the

Board approve the list of recommended grantees; staff will move expeditiously to execute the grant agreements (contracts) with effective dates of December 1, 2009. Staff plans to conduct a New Grantee Briefing in early December 2009 and will work closely with the grantees to ensure that acceptable data collection systems are in place for the cross-site evaluation. Staff recommends the CSA Board approve the ESC funding recommendations for the Proud Parenting Program.

Ms. Biondi asked if it would be possible to get a description of what the grantees plan to do specifically.

Mr. Villegas replied that a lot of the specifics along with their plans will be posted on CSA's website once it has been approved by the Board.

Mr. Cate asked for further discussion or questions. There were none.

A motion to accept staff recommendations was made by Mr. Ingrassia and seconded by Ms. Bates. The motion carried.

STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION **(AGENDA ITEM B-5)**

Wayne Landberg presented this item which gives the Board an opportunity to provide input to help proactively shape the initiatives and resource allocation of the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) over the next two years. As California's fiscal crisis continues, State agencies are forced to analyze every aspect of daily operations in search of greater efficiencies and cost savings. Several Board members and other stakeholders have indicated a desire for CSA to focus on particular themes or topics. The CSA staff is working to meet the competing needs and expectations all stakeholders, however, the addition of new responsibilities and the reduction of resources have hampered those efforts. In order to make the most effective use of limited public resources, this workshop is intended to facilitate a dialogue with Board members that will result in a unified set of priorities from the perspective of the Board. The CSA staff will return to the Board, at a future meeting, to present a summary of the findings and strategic direction of the organization. Staff recommends full participation in the planning session.

C: PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Cate asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Mr. Cate thanked staff for their work on behalf of the Board and called the meeting to a close.

Next meeting: Thursday, January 14, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. in Sacramento, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Originally signed by

KRYSTEN MEYER
Executive Assistant
Corrections Standards Authority

ROSTER OF PERSONS IN ATTENDANCE

CSA Board Members

Mr. Cate, Secretary, CDCR
Mr. Kernan, Undersecretary, CDCR
Mr. Warner, Chief Deputy Secretary, Juvenile Justice
Mr. Baca, Sheriff, Los Angeles County
Ms. Bates, Supervisor, Orange County
Ms. Minor, Chief, Division of Adult Programs
Ms. Campbell, President, Memory of Victims Everywhere and Force 100
Ms. Epps, Supervising Probation Officer, San Bernardino County
Ms. Silva, Administrator (A), Department of Juvenile Justice
Ms. Penner, Fresno County Probation Department
Mr. Ingrassia, San Diego County Sheriff's Department
Ms. Biondi, Public Member
Ms. Silbert, Executive Director, Delancey Street Foundation
Mr. Adams, Yuba County Sheriff's Department
Mr. Townsy, Folsom State Prison

CSA Staff

Kurt O. Wilson, Executive Director
Robert Takeshta, Deputy Director, CFC
Marlon Yarber, Deputy Director, CPP
Gary Wion, Deputy Director, FSO
Leslie Heller, Field Representative, CFC
Charlene Aboytes, Field Representative, CFC
Shaline Hunter, Field Representative, CPP
Wayne Landberg, STC
Oscar Villegas, CPP